REMARKS

In the above-identified Office Action, the Examiner has rejected claims 2 and 4 as being anticipated by the patent to Lekholm et al. Applicant has amended claims 2 and 4 so that they are now novel over Lekholm et al. More specifically, claim 2 now recites an opening through the partition wall which communicates through the interior of the void to outside the void with a magnetic sensor inserted into the opening. Further, the void is now recited as having the entire inner wall in smooth spherical regular polyhedron form. These new elements are not found in Lekholm. Lekholm does not have an opening through this partition wall, nor does it have a magnetic sensor inserted into the opening. Thus, Applicant believes that claim 2 is now novel when contrasted with Lekholm. Further, there is no teaching or suggestion by Lekholm for such changes in Lekholm structure. Thus, claim 2 is also non-obvious over Lekholm.

Claim 4 also recites a hole through the partition wall communicating from the interior of the void to the outside of the void. Further, claim 4 also recites a visco-elastic body in the void for holding the magnetic member. In addition, the magnetic sensor is now recited as being inserted into the hole with the detection end directed toward the interior of the void. Lekholm does not teach the hole through the partition wall, nor does it teach the visco-elastic body which holds the magnetic member. The Examiner states that column 3, lines 7-15 of Lekholm teaches a visco-elastic body. However, a close reading of Lekholm shows that it only teaches a *"fluid of selected viscosity"*; this is not visco-elasticity. A visco-elastic material comprises of material has no fluidity, such as a sponge or a gel. A viscous material comprises a material which has fluidity such as oil. Thus, Lekholm does not teach such a visco-elastic material as recited in claim 4. A magnetic member sealed in a void filled with a visco-elastic material vibrates only when a vibration is applied to the magnetic member and returns to the original position when the vibration stops. In other words, the magnetic member keeps its position in the void at the predetermined position. On the other hand, a magnetic member that is sealed in a void filled with a viscous material moves in the viscous material and does not keep its position in the void at a predetermined position. Thus, the movement and the operation of the magnetic member differs substantially between the structure of amended claim 4 and the structure of Lekholm et al.

The void in the structure of amended claim 2 is a smooth spherical regular polyhedron shape. The void of Lekholm has cavities 53 which imparts a rough surface to the void. Thus, in Lekholm et al. when the sensor in FIG. 16 rotates 90°, the magnetic member *"spherical dipole"* 54 falls into the cavity 53 and cannot move. In the sensor of the amended claim 2, the magnetic member would still be movable even if rotated in the same manner. Thus, the movement and operation of the magnetic member differs substantially in the amended claim 2 structure and the structure of Lekholm et al.

Applicant hereby requests reconsideration and reexamination thereof.

With the above amendments and remarks, this application is considered ready for allowance and Applicant earnestly solicits an early notice of same. Should the Examiner be of the opinion that a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of the subject application, he is respectfully requested to call the undersigned at the below-listed number.

Respectfully submitted,
WELSH & KATZ, LTD.

Gerald T. Shekleton
Registration No. 27,466

Date: **February 24, 2006**
WELSH & KATZ, LTD.
120 South Riverside Plaza
22nd Floor
Chicago, Illinois 60606-3912
Telephone: (312) 655-1500
Facsimile (312) 655-1501